

Chapter 6.8

Managing Intercultural Communication Differences in E-Collaboration

Norhayati Zakaria

Universiti Utara Malaysia, Malaysia

INTRODUCTION

With the heightened trends of globalization and increased sophistication of computer-mediated communication (CMC) technologies, people can collaborate anywhere, at anytime, and with anyone. Thus, it can be argued that distance no longer matters. Yet at the same time, people will continue to be confronted with different cultural backgrounds that present conflicts in terms of value systems, attitudes, beliefs, and basic assumptions. In this respect culture does matter, even at a distance. As such multinational corporations (MNCs) need to ascertain the compatibility between the types of technology to be selected and used, and their employees' cultural values when they assemble global virtual teams from all parts of the world.

Global virtual teams can be defined as people who work in a geographically and organizationally dispersed locations, composed of heterogeneous team members, and they use computer-mediated

communication technologies during e-collaboration (Zakaria, Amelinckx, & Wilemon, 2004). Due to the increasing use of global virtual teams as a new working structure, MNCs need to manage intercultural communication, defined as interaction between people of diverse cultural backgrounds with distinct communication patterns, preferences, and styles (Novinger, 2001; Gudykunst, 1997). Edward Hall (1976), an intercultural communication theorist, has established that different cultures communicate using different styles that impact face-to-face communication and collaboration. In addition, manifestations of culture are often shown in a person's intercultural communicative behaviors.

Several studies have established that communicative behaviors vary across and within cultures, and that these variations can be explained by Hall's concept of cultural diversity. In his theory called high vs. low context, he explained that communicative behavior is strongly rooted in one's cultural background. For example, in

high context cultures (e.g., Malaysia, Korea, Japan, France, etc.), people put more emphasis on non-verbal cues, and in low context cultures (e.g., USA, UK, Italy, Australia, etc.), people rely more on words spoken or written.

In order to avoid misunderstanding and misinterpretations, it is important to comprehend the meaning in what a person says and also how things are said—that is, the communication style one uses for generating ideas, exchanging opinions, sharing knowledge, and expressing ideas. Therefore, this article presents two key research questions:

1. What are the impacts of culture on the global virtual teams' performance during e-collaboration?
2. How do MNCs build intercultural communication competencies to manage cultural differences among global virtual teams?

This article will be organized as follows: in the first section, I will introduce the phenomenon of globally distributed collaboration, or what I term e-collaboration, to point out the significance of a new working structure—global virtual teams. Next, I will present the research gaps that are identified between cross-cultural management, intercultural communication, and CMC to provide concrete background to the phenomenon. Third, I will highlight the potential cultural impacts on e-collaboration. Fourth, I will provide a conceptual framework of building intercultural communication competencies, with suggestions on how to manage the cultural differences in global virtual teams. Finally, I will conclude the article by providing some managerial and theoretical implications of e-collaboration.

BACKGROUND

Based on the past studies, substantial empirical research in cross-cultural management and inter-

cultural communication literature has established that numerous challenges arise when people of different cultures collaborate and communicate at an interpersonal level (Adler, 2002; Gudykunst, 2003; Hooker, 2003). The findings suggest that the challenges that exist in one's communicative behaviors can lead to potential managerial problems such as communication misunderstandings and misinterpretations, intensified conflicts, failure to coordinate, ineffective decision-making, anxieties and uncertainties, and many more (Adler, 2002; Gudykunst & Kim, 2005; Ting-Toomey, 2005).

In a similar vein, CMC literature has observed that technology may facilitate or hinder effective communication (Daft & Lengel, 1986; Kiesler & Sproull, 1992; Sproull & Kiesler, 1986; Walther, 1996) depending on the compatibility of values such as task fit vs. culture fit vs. technology fit. Daft and Lengel's (1984) theory of media richness explains that whether a technology is appropriate for a given managerial task depends on the technology's richness or leanness. E-mail is considered a lean medium, since it relies solely on written text, and videoconferencing is considered a rich medium, since it has verbal, audio, and visual components. Daft and Lengel argue that e-mail fails to evoke sufficient and necessary social and contextual cues and that such technology may therefore not be desirable or effective in a culture that is highly dependent on non-verbal cues when communicating, as in the high context cultures. In contrast, for a culture that is dependent on words or the content of a message such as low context culture, e-mail would be an appropriate tool that facilitates distributed collaboration and communication.

It is well established that computer-mediated communication (CMC) allows people to communicate and collaborate unrestricted by barriers of time and space. Additionally, given the distributed and non-hierarchical nature of global virtual teams, CMC is an ideal method of communication among the members. CMC is defined as a process whereby messages are electronically

7 more pages are available in the full version of this document, which may be purchased using the "Add to Cart" button on the publisher's webpage:

www.igi-global.com/chapter/managing-intercultural-communication-differences-collaboration/8863

Related Content

Setting the Framework of E-Collaboration for E-Science

Andrea Bosin, Nicoletta Dessì, Maria Grazia Fugini, Diego Liberati and Barbara Pes (2008). *Encyclopedia of E-Collaboration* (pp. 554-560).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/setting-framework-collaboration-science/12479

Introduction to Recommender Systems

François Fouss (2011). *Collaborative Search and Communities of Interest: Trends in Knowledge Sharing and Assessment* (pp. 21-37).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/introduction-recommender-systems/46759

The Role of Perceived E-Collaborative Performance in an Extended Theory of Planned Behavior Model

Eddie W.L. Cheng and Samuel K.W. Chu (2016). *International Journal of e-Collaboration* (pp. 24-40).

www.irma-international.org/article/the-role-of-perceived-e-collaborative-performance-in-an-extended-theory-of-planned-behavior-model/164496

A Technology for Pattern-Based Process Design and its Application to Collaboration Engineering

Gwen L. Kolfschoten, Robert O. Briggs and Gert-Jan de Vreede (2010). *Collaborative Technologies and Applications for Interactive Information Design: Emerging Trends in User Experiences* (pp. 1-18).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/technology-pattern-based-process-design/37049

The Impact of Perceived Subgroup Formation on Transactive Memory Systems and Performance in Distributed Teams

Yide Shen, Michael J. Gallivan and Xinlin Tang (2016). *International Journal of e-Collaboration* (pp. 44-66).

www.irma-international.org/article/the-impact-of-perceived-subgroup-formation-on-transactive-memory-systems-and-performance-in-distributed-teams/143889